

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MICHELLE LYNN BURNELL,

CASE NO. C22-0265JLR

11 Plaintiff,

ORDER

12 v.

13 LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD &
14 SMITH LLP, et al.,

Defendants.

15 Before the court is Defendants Lewis Brisbois Bisgaard & Smith LLP, Heather M.
16 Jensen, and Annemarie McDowell's (collectively, "Defendants") motion for an extension
17 of the deadlines set forth in the court's June 15, 2022 order regarding initial disclosures
18 and joint status report. (Mot. (Dkt. # 34); 6/15/22 Order (Dkt. # 24); Reply (Dkt. # 36).)
19 Under the court's June 15, 2022 scheduling order, the parties are to: confer pursuant to
20 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) by June 22, 2022; make initial disclosures by July
21 6, 2022; and file a joint status report by July 13, 2022. (*See generally* 6/15/22 Order.)
22

1 Defendants ask the court to extend the deadlines for initial disclosures and joint status
2 report “until sometime after the [c]ourt hears Defendants’ motion to dismiss” for
3 insufficient service of process and “decides whether the action should be dismissed.”
4 (Mot. at 3; *see also* MTD (Dkt. # 25).) *Pro se* Plaintiff Michelle Lynn Burnell has not
5 responded to Defendants’ motion. (*See generally* Dkt.) The court may consider Ms.
6 Burnell’s failure to respond as an admission on her part that Defendants’ motion has
7 merit. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(b)(2) (“[I]f a party fails to file papers in
8 opposition to a motion, such failure may be considered by the court as an admission that
9 the motion has merit.”).

10 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1)(A) authorizes the court to extend “for
11 good cause” the time to perform an act if the request for an extension is made before the
12 original time to perform the act expires. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A); *see also Landis v.*
13 *North Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254-55 (1936) (stating that the court has the inherent
14 authority “to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and
15 effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants”). Here, the “good cause” standard applies
16 because Defendants timely filed their motion for an extension of time prior to the initial
17 disclosure and joint status report deadlines set forth in the court’s June 15, 2022 order.
18 (*See generally* Mot.) The court finds that Defendants have demonstrated good cause for
19 an extension of the initial disclosures and joint status report deadlines in the court’s June
20 15, 2022 order.

21 Therefore, the court GRANTS Defendants’ motion for an extension of the
22 deadlines set forth in the court’s June 15, 2022 order regarding initial disclosures and

1 joint status report (Dkt. # 34). In addition, the court VACATES the deadlines set forth in
2 the court's June 15, 2022 order regarding initial disclosures and joint status report (Dkt.
3 # 24). The court will issue an amended order regarding initial disclosures and joint status
4 report, if necessary, following its consideration of Defendants' motion to dismiss.

5 Dated this 1st day of July, 2022.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22



JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge